



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1470
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,588	09/07/2000	Michael J. Duigou	5181-72300	1253

7590 02/16/2006

Robert C Kowert
Conley Rose & Tayon P C
P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/656,588

Applicant(s)

DUIGOU ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas B. Blair

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-54 are currently pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-9, 11-15, 19-27, 29-33, 37-47, and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article entitled "Composable ad hoc location-based services for heterogeneous mobile clients" by Hodes in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,532,368 to Hild et al..
4. As to claim 1, Hodes teaches a method of accessing a service, comprising: a client device forming a communication link with a service device (Section 3.3); the client device directly requesting to the service device a document that describes an interface to access a service provided by the service device (Section 3.3); the client device receiving said document directly from the service device, wherein said document comprises information describing how to access the service (Section 3.7.2); wherein said requesting and said receiving are performed over said communication link (Section 3.4); and the client device using the information from said document to access the service (Section 3.7.2); however Roberts does not explicitly teach a direct point-to-point link.

Art Unit: 2142

Hild teaches a method for accessing a service using a direct point-to-point link (col. 8, lines 9-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hode regarding the discovery of interfaces for accessing a service with the teachings of Hild regarding accessing a service via a direct point-to-point link because a point-to-point link would be a common way of accessing a service interaction proxy such as the one taught by Hode.

5. As to claim 2, Hode teaches requesting comprising the client sending an advertisement request message for the service to the service device over the communication link, wherein the advertisement request message is in a data representation language (Section 3.3).

6. As to claim 3, Hode teaches the data representation language is XML (Section 3.7.2).

7. As to claim 4, Hode teaches a method wherein said document comprises a service advertisement for the service, wherein said service advertisement comprises a schema specifying an interface to at least a portion of the service (Section 3.7.2).

8. As to claim 5, Hode teaches a method wherein said schema is an XML schema defining XML messages for a client on the client device to send the service and the service to send to the client in order for the client to access capabilities of the service (Section 3.7.2).

9. As to claim 6, Hode teaches a method wherein the client device using the information from said document comprises the client sending one or more of said XML messages to the service over said communication link (Section 3.7.2).

10. As to claim 7, Hode teaches a method wherein said receiving comprises receiving said document in an advertisement request response message sent from the service over said

Art Unit: 2142

communication link, wherein the advertisement request response message is in a data representation language (Section 3.7.2).

11. As to claim 8, Hode teaches a method wherein the data representation language is XML (Section 3.7.2).

12. As to claim 9, Hode teaches a method wherein the client device in proximity to a service device for wireless communications (Section 3.5).

13. As to claim 11, Hode teaches a method wherein the client device is in wireless proximity of the service device (Section 3.5 among others).

14. As to claim 12, Hode teaches a method wherein said requesting comprises including client security credential in a request to said service device for said document, and wherein said service device authenticates said client security credential before sending said document to the client device (Section 3.7.4).

15. As to claim 13, Hode teaches a method wherein said client device using the information from said document to access the service comprises: a client on the client device requesting a security credential from an authentication service specified in said document; the client receiving said security credential (Section 3.6); and the client including said security credential with a subsequent to the service to access a capability of the service (Section 3.6).

16. As to claim 14, Hode teaches a method comprising the service verifying the client's security credential before allowing access to the capability (Section 3.6).

17. As to claim 15, Hode teaches a method wherein said authentication service is provided by the service device (Section 3.6).

Art Unit: 2142

18. As to claims 19-33 and 39-51, they feature limitations found in claims 1-15 and are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-15.

19. As to claim 37, it features limitations corresponding to the client in claim 1 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

20. As to claim 38, it features limitations corresponding to the server in claim 1 and is therefore rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

21. Claims 10, 28, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article entitled "Composable ad hoc location-based services for heterogeneous mobile clients" by Hodes in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,532,368 to Hild et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,795,429 to Schuster et al..

22. As to claim 10, the Hodes-Hild combination combines to make claim 1 obvious; however the Hodes-Hild combination does not explicitly teach the use of a IrDA infrared link.

Schuster teaches the use of an IrDA infrared link to access a service (col. 5, lines 52-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Hodes-Hild combination regarding wireless communication with the teachings of Schuster regarding IrDA links because such links are common in wireless communications (Schuster, col. 5, lines 52-61).

23. As to claims 28 and 48, they are rejected for the same reasons as claim 10.

24. Claims 16-18, 34-36, and 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article entitled "Composable ad hoc location-based services for heterogeneous mobile clients" by Hodes in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,532,368 to Hild et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,405,027 to Bell.

Art Unit: 2142

25. As to claim 16, the Hodes-Hild combination does not explicitly teach a client device being a bridge.

Bell teaches a client device acting as a bridge (col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Hodes-Hild combination regarding wireless communication with the teachings of Bell regarding using wireless device as a bridge because such configurations are useful in conferencing situations (col. 1, lines 18-40).

26. As to claim 17, Bell teaches a transport connection comprising a network connection (col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 46).

27. As to claim 18, Bell teaches a network connection comprising an internet connection (col. 2, line 64-col. 3, line 46).

28. As to claims 34-36 and 52-54, they feature limitations found in claims 16-18 and are rejected for the same reasons as claims 16-18.

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments filed 1/11/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the following points: a) Instead of client requesting interface documents directly from service devices, Hodes teaches that SIPs aggregate service information for multiple service devices, such as all the controllable lights in a room; b) Hodes in view of Hild fails to teach or suggest the client device forming a direct point-to-point communication link with the service device; c) Merely because a direct point-to-point link may be "a common way of accessing" devices in some contexts, does not provide any motivation to modify the

Art Unit: 2142

system of Hodes way from the use of SIPs providing aggregated service information to clients; and d) Modifying Hodes so that client's directly request service information from the service devices themselves via direct point-to-point link would clearly change the principle of operation of Hodes' system.

30. As to point a), the claim language merely states that the client requests a service directly from the service device. There is no limitation which states that the service is on the service device. The SIP reads on the service device because it is in fact a device that provides services. The SIP provides interface specifications to the client which are considered document describing an interface.

31. As to point b-d), the paradigm of Hode teaches a wireless system for accessing services. Hode does not explicitly describe a method for accessing the wireless system. Hild shows that a point-to-point connection is an obvious way to access a wireless system. The use of a point-to-point connection to access a wireless device is not a novel concept.

Conclusion

32. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2142


will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is 571-272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Douglas Blair



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER